

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 11, and 23-28 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 4 and 5 have been canceled; and claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 11, 23, and 25-27 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims Objections

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claim 5. Claim 5 has been canceled, thereby obviating the objection.

§112 Rejection of Claims 4 and 5

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 4 and 5 have been canceled, thereby obviating the rejection.

§103 Rejection of Claims 2-3, 9, 11, 23, and 25-27

In Section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 2-3, 9, 11, 23, and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,535; hereinafter referred to as "Heidin") in view of Ranger (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,940). Independent claims 23 and 25-27 have been amended to address the rejection.

In the Background section of the Specification, it was disclosed that portable devices are in wide use today. The size and weight of the portable device can be significantly reduced to increase the portability by using a speech recognition device rather than a conventional input device, such as a keyboard or keypad. "However, if a speech recognition device is used in the portable terminal as means for recognizing the input information, it is extremely difficult to eliminate errors in speech recognition. Moreover, the probability of accurate recognition of the input audio information in the conventional speech recognition device is not that high." *The background of the Specification, page 2, lines 7-10.*

Embodiments of the present invention provide contents selection system and method designed to overcome the above-described shortcomings of the speech recognition device. For example, the structure of system claim 23, as presented herein, includes

“a client configured to *successively transmit a series of input speech information* to a server over a network, the series of input speech information including previous, current, and subsequent input speech information; and

a server configured to receive the successively transmitted series of input speech information from said client, and to generate contents selection information in response to the series of input speech information,

wherein said server *generates the contents selection information for each stage of the transmission of the series of input speech information by calculating the similarity of acoustic characteristic quantities between the current input speech information and the contents selection information generated for the previous input speech information*, and said server indicating a match when a number of the calculated similarity of acoustic characteristic quantities exceeds a

predetermined number, such that the match determines the contents selection information of the subsequent input speech information.” (emphasis added)

However, the cited prior art references, including Hedin and Ranger, in combination or individually, fail to teach or suggest generating contents selection information for each stage of the transmission of the series of input speech information by calculating the similarity of acoustic characteristic quantities between the current input speech information and the contents selection information generated for the previous input speech information, where a match is indicated when a number of the calculated similarity of acoustic characteristic quantities exceeds a predetermined number, such that the match determines the contents selection information of the subsequent input speech information. The contents selection information for different stages of the transmission of the series of input speech information can include a title, a performer name, a genre, and other related information.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it is maintained that claim 23 should be allowable over the combination of Hedin and Ranger. Furthermore, since independent claims 25-27 closely parallel, and include substantially similar limitations as, independent claim 23, claims 25-27 should also be allowable over the combination of Hedin and Ranger. Further, since claims 2-3, 9, and 11 depend from claims 23, 25, and 26, respectively, claims 2-3, 9, and 11 should also be allowable over the combination of Hedin and Ranger.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-3, 9, 11, 23, and 25-27 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 4 and 5

In Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin in view of Ranger, and further in view of Will (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,117) and well-known prior art (MPEP 2144.03). Claims 4 and 5 have been canceled, thereby obviating the rejection.

§103 Rejection of Claims 6 and 7

In Section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin in view of Ranger, and further in view of Ladd *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,493,671; hereinafter referred to as "Ladd").

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claim 23, and since claims 6 and 7 depend indirectly from claim 23, it is maintained that claims 6 and 7 should be allowable over the combination of Hedin and Ranger. Furthermore, since it was indicated in Section 8 that Ladd discloses a markup language for interactive service to notify a user of an event and methods thereof, it is maintained that Ladd fails to teach or suggest generating contents selection information for each stage of the transmission of the series of input speech information by calculating the similarity of acoustic characteristic quantities between the current input speech information and the contents selection information generated for the previous input speech information, where a match is indicated when a number of the calculated similarity of acoustic characteristic quantities exceeds a predetermined number, such that the match determines the contents selection information of the subsequent input speech information. Therefore, claims 6 and 7 should be allowable over the combination of Hedin, Ranger, and Ladd.

§103 Rejection of Claims 24 and 28

In Section 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin in view of Ranger, and further in view of Milsted *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,263,313; hereinafter referred to as "Milsted").

Based on the foregoing discussion regarding claims 23 and 27, and since claims 24 and 28 depend from claims 23 and 27, respectively, it is maintained that claims 23 and 27 should be allowable over the combination of Hedin and Ranger. Furthermore, since it was indicated in Section 9 that Milsted discloses method and apparatus to create encoded digital content, to determine the genre of the music selected, and to allow browsing on a browser with list of titles and performers, Milsted still fails to teach or suggest generating contents selection information for each stage of the transmission of the series of input speech information by calculating the similarity of acoustic characteristic quantities between the current input speech information and the contents selection information generated for the previous input speech information, where a match is indicated when a number of the calculated similarity of acoustic characteristic quantities exceeds a predetermined number, such that the match determines the contents selection information of the subsequent input speech information. Therefore, claims 24 and 28 should be allowable over the combination of Hedin, Ranger, and Milsted.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 2-3, 6-7, 9, 11, and 23-28 are respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over

the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes that have been made to these claims were not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes were made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Samuel S. Lee, Reg. No. 42,791
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800